

Tom Staker
Bob Compton

Observations From OA ISM Evaluations

March 15, 2002



Background

- Expectation to apply lessons learned is ingrained in many DOE policies
- Essential element of ISM Core Function 5
- Expectations and guidance, but no DOE order
- Programs evaluated by OA-50
- Common strengths and weaknesses



Expectations

- DOE Policy 450.4
- DOE Standard 7501-99

DOE Handbook 7502-95

SELLS Fact Sheets



What's Working and What's Not



Roles and Responsibilities

(+) R&Rs are defined in written procedures

(+) Contractor R&Rs are detailed in job descriptions



Staff Qualification & Training

- (+) Listed in position descriptions and training plans for staff
- (-) Training for managers and users less well defined



Researching Potential Sources

- (+) Generally addressed in program procedures
- (–) Minimal population to be screened not specified
- (–) Documentation of screening/results not required



LL Criteria & Thresholds

- (+) Need to identify internal LL specified.
- (+) Criteria/thresholds described in general terms
- (–) Need to incorporate LL generation in work control procedures
- (-) Management needs to encourage/emphasize generating internal lessons learned



Timeliness Requirements for Generation and Incorporation

(+/-) Timeliness requirements not often specified, but rarely a problem in performance



Validation and Approval Processes

(+) Usually adequately incorporated into procedures



Dissemination Methods

- (+) Dissemination vehicles usually described in procedures
- (+) Email, Web databases, safety committees, newsletters, and bulletin board postings
- (–) Some sites lack searchable, user friendly databases or easy access to historical lessons learned
- (-) Poor sharing of internal lessons learned with other facilities and especially the DOE complex



Applying Lessons Learned

- (+) Addressed in general terms in lessons learned, work planning, and training procedures
- (-) Procedures often lack specifics
- (-) Record of application poorly documented
- (-) Applicability and actions not tailored to site/facility



Documentation Requirements

- (-) Lack of formality most common program weakness
- (-) "Too hard/No help" view pervasive
- (+) Key element of successful management systems
 - Provides the incentive to do the right thing
 - Provides the basis for verifying implementation
 - Can be crafted to minimize impact



Feedback Systems

- (–) Expectations/processes not typically in procedures
- (-) Feedback on successes and needed process improvements are informal



Tracking Lessons Learned Actions

- (+) Typically limited to major events/actions
- (-) Requirements not specified in procedures
- (-) Tracking informal, inconsistent, incomplete



Performance Indicators and Trend Analysis

- (-) Trending very limited and rudimentary
- (-) Use of performance indicators rare
- (+/-) Expectations/guidance provided, execution can be difficult



Performance Assessment

- (+) Guidance available in Appendix C of the DOE Standard
- (-) Few self or independent assessments performed
- (-) When performed, need more rigor and ensure deficiencies are adequately addressed



Management Commitment

(+) Commitment communicated in policies and statements

- (-) Commitment not always demonstrated beyond policy:
 - Inadequate Resources
 - Little Performance Monitoring
 - Little Accountability for Ineffective Implementation



Opportunities For Improvement

- More Formality and Rigor
- Routinely Assess and Monitor Performance
- Demonstrate Management Commitment



Summary

- Consistent Performance
 - Common Strengths
 - Common Weaknesses
- Lack of Formality and Rigor
 - Incentive to Perform
 - Objective Evidence/Evaluation Basis
- Demonstrate Management Commitment
 - Expectations, Resources, Encouragement, Monitoring, Accountability